have been made of the quantity of produce to be given to the khatedars.

Reply of Government.—The remedy appears to lie in the parties specifying the maximum amount recoverable under the chit. The Deputy Commissioner, however, will be asked to enquire and report whether there are many cases of this kind and whether there is any real hardship.

SUBJECT No. 60.

Hypothecation deeds involving immovable property worth less than Rs. 100 to be registered.

Mr. T. Devappa, Shikarpur Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—The registration of hypothecation deeds involving immovable property worth less than Rs. 100 is not compulsory and consequently there is scope for persons to deceive the money-lenders by hypothecating the same property to more than one person and getting only one of the documents registered. In Civil Courts preference is given to registered documents. It should therefore be ruled that all documents involving immovable property worth Rs. 100 or less should be registered. This will prevent fraud.

Reply of Government.—This is not expedient. Judging from the growing number of optional registrations, no compulsory provision seems called for.

SUBJECT No. 61.

Registration fees on documents.

Messrs. Subba Rao of Heggaddevankote; Krishna Rao of T. Narsipur; Padmanna of Nanjangud Taluk; Chandrasekharaiya and Gundappa of Nagamangala; Lingegowda of Mysore Taluk; Shama Iyengar of Chamrajnagar; Amble Annaiya Pandit, Mysore District Board; Sahukar Nagappa, Manjaiya Udupara, Nagar Taluk; Y. Subba Rao, Sagar Taluk; Padmarajaiya, Krishnappa, Channarayapatna Taluk; G. Subba Rao, Hole-Narsipur Taluk; Hutcheeregowda, Gubbi Taluk; Desakulakarni Dasappa, Channalingappa of Nelamangala Taluk; Ranga Iyengar of Channapatna Taluk; Shanbhog Shamaiya of Kankanhalli Taluk; Varadachar and Narasimhaiya of Chikballapur; Chikkannaiya of Goribidnur; Naranappa of Sidlaghatta; B. Sitaramaiya of Chikmagalur Taluk; Srikantaiya, Maddagiri Taluk; Chikramanna and Suryanaranappa, Kolar Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—According to the new Registration Rules, much difficulty is felt by the public owing to the recovery of a fee of two annas for every 100 words in a document. As per old rules, a fee of four annas was being levied on every 100 words in excess of the first 300 words. As the Government income increases, the public expect proportionate good. As the new rules have proved a hardship, it is prayed that Government may be pleased to pass proceedings discontinuing the levy of fees in proportion to the words contained in the document.

Reply of Government.—It is only an experiment and will be reconsidered after a year, if necessary.

SUBJECT No. 62.

Sub-Registrars' fees for registration of documents at the residence of the parties.

(*a*) Messrs. Ameen Krishnappa and Sivappa Deekshit, Shikarpur Taluk.
(*b*) Messrs. Varadachr and Y. Narasimhaiya of Chikballapur.

Summary of discussion.—(*a*) Sub-Registrars when required to register documents at places other than their office, charge a commission of Rs. 10 as fees and a mileage of four annas. This is heavy. Many cannot ask the Sub-Registrars to go to their villages for registration. It is therefore requested that the mileage of Sub-Registrars may be ordered to be paid out of the commission amount instead of making it an additional levy.

(*b*) The rate of Rs. 10 fixed as commission to be paid to Sub-Registrars for registration at private residences is high. The rate may be reduced to five rupees.

Reply of Government.—The question of reducing the commission was considered by Government in January 1905, and it was deemed inexpedient to do so.

SUBJECT No. 63.

Inspection of stamp vendors' registers by Special Sub-Registrars.

Messrs. Balavanta Rao, Arsikere Taluk; and Varada Iyengar, Hassan Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—It is requested that Special Sub-Registrars may be empowered to inspect stamp vendors' registers.

Reply of Government.—No objection. This may be done.

SUBJECT No. 64.

Tax on kanas should be abolished.

Messrs. Sowcar Nagappa, Manjaiya Udaparu, Nagar Taluk; Pedachavalli Sannegowda, Manjarabad Taluk.

REVENUE.

Summary of discussion.—Assessment on kanas should be abolished, as the raiyats use these for harvesting crop and storing fodder, fuel, hay, etc. They have no sufficient space attached to their houses for these purposes.

Reply of Government.—The opinions of the Revenue Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner of Shimoga have been called for. They will be asked to expedite their reports and submit them for early decision.

SUBJECT No. 65.

Revision of assessment on well irrigated dry lands.

Mr. Chikkannaiya, Goribidnur Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—At the original Survey Settlement the assessment on dry lands containing wells constructed by the owners thereof at their own cost was not disturbed even though wet crops were raised by means of wells standing thereon. Many such wells have been constructed on dry lands at a large outlay. The raiyats are now afraid that such lands containing private wells will be brought under garden assessment at the revision Survey. Orders may be passed that dry assessment already made may not be disturbed in such cases.

Reply of Government.—There is apparently some misapprehension. The rules are based on liberal lines. In the case of self-dependent wells, the lands are assessed at simple dry-crop rates. In the case of wells deriving their supply directly or by percolation from water flowing in defined channels or tanks, they are assessed at the highest dry rates. Where the lands are irrigated directly from the tank or the channel, and the well is only supplementary, the assessment is on merits. The rules will be published as official papers in the Gazette.

SUBJECT No. 66.

Abolition of the wet rates of assessment on rice-growing lands in the beds of saguvalikattes constructed at private cost.

Mr. Srinivasa Rao, Harihar Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—The rice-growing lands in the beds of saguvalikattes constructed at private cost are assessed at wet rates. On the assessment so fixed, local and irrigation cesses are also collected. This assessment should be abolished. If this is not possible, the irrigation cess at least should be dispensed with.

Reply of Government.—Nothing need be done in this matter. Individual grievances, if any, may be represented and they will be enquired into.